DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 987 JC 960 401

TITLE	Performance Review of Accountability in the Community College System. Research Report 96-2.
INSTITUTION	Florida State House of Representatives, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	1995-12-07
NOTE	24p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Community Colleges; *Governing Boards; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; School Effectiveness; *State Programs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida Community College System; *Trustee Role

ABSTRACT

In 1991, the Florida State Legislature established an accountability process for the state's community college system to foster institutional self-examination and improvement. In 1995, the Legislature undertook a review of the process to determine the extent that it had been implemented, the usefulness of specific documents, and the level of involvement of boards of trustees. Accountability reports prepared by all 28 community colleges were reviewed, while a sample of 13 colleges were requested to provide: documents used in developing accountability measures, agenda and minutes from accountability-related board meetings, lists of individuals involved in accountability, and recent presidential evaluations. The study concluded: the process had been successfully implemented at both the institutional and system levels; when the board of trustees were intimately involved in the process of accountability, its implementation was not uniformly apparent; board members who had served for more than 4 years were unaware of most recent legislative mandates; and institutions that had undergone or were preparing for accreditation review had more comprehensive accountability reports than other colleges. Recommendations developed from the findings include requiring trustee orientations, limiting the length that presidential contracts remain in force between board renewals, and consolidating the accountability process and performance-based budgeting. Sections from the State Education Code relating to accountability and a summary of college responses are appended. Contains 10 references. (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 987

December 7, 1995

Research Report **96-2**

Legislative Catalog Number: HE-003.1295

Committee on Higher Education

The Florida House of Representatives

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Haller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Performance Review of Accountability in the Community College System

JC 960 401

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Executive Summary 2

Overview of Accountability 3

Overview of Presidential Assessment 5

Research Design and Methodology 6

Survey Results 7

Key Survey Findings 10

Findings and Conclusions 11

Policy Recommendations 12

Appendices

Community College Accountability Process 13
Organization of Boards of Trustees 14
Boards of Trustees Powers and Duties 15
Legislative Intent 19
Institutional Information Response Summary 20

References 21

Introduction

As a step toward encouraging community colleges to increase their effectiveness and efficiency, the 1991 Legislature enacted s. 240.324 F.S., establishing the community college accountability process. The intent of this law was to foster institutional self examination and improvement.

The first systemic community college report was not provided to the Legislature until 1994 due to the development of a new management information system. As a result, it is not possible at this time to assess whether the accountability process has been successful in improving efficiency and effectiveness. However, this report will determine if the law has been implemented in a manner which provides the boards which govern and coordinate the system with the information necessary to set policy and oversee the operation of the system.

This performance evaluation will review the following:

1. To what extent has the accountability process been used for institutional assessment?

2. What specific documents have been provided to community college boards of trustees related to accountability?

3. Do the accountability documents provide information in a timely manner and in a format which is useful in making policy decisions?

4. What was the level of involvement of the boards of trustees in the accountability process?

A community college president serves as the executive officer and corporate secretary to the board of trustees, as well as the chief administrative officer of the college. All components of the institution and all aspects of the colleges operation are responsible to the board of trustees through the president. The boards of trustees do have the power to take action without a recommendation from the president. Since the president's annual evaluation is statutorily required to link with the accountability plan, this evaluation will review the following:

5. How the institutional accountability reports have been linked to the annual evaluations of community college presidents by the local boards of trustees?

6. What guidance and oversight has the State Board of Community Colleges provided the institutions in evaluating presidents related to accountability?

7. Do the evaluations provide for an assessment of the quality of management?

Executive Summary

As a step toward encouraging community colleges to increase their effectiveness and efficiency, the 1991 Legislature enacted s. 240.324, Florida Statutes, establishing the community college accountability process. The intent of this law was to foster institutional self examination and improvement. This report will determine if the law has been implemented in a manner which provides the boards which govern and coordinate the system with the information necessary to set policy and oversee the operation of the system.

Summary of Findings

- The Legislative reporting function of accountability has been successfully implemented at both the institutional level and at the system level.
- The implementation of accountability as an institutional assessment tool, where the boards of trustees are intimately involved in the process, is not uniformly apparent.
- Board members who had served for more than four years indicated ignorance on some of the most recent legislative mandates. They suggested requiring orientation for reappointed board members.
- Generally, those institutions which had recently been through or were preparing for an accreditation review (SACS) appeared to have more comprehensive accountability reports than those who had not had a review for some time.

Summary of Policy Recommendations

- The Legislature should consider requiring each trustee, upon appointment and reappointment, to take part in the Division sponsored trustee orientation
- The Legislature should consider limiting the contractual period for presidents without affirmative renewal by the boards of trustees. The Division has suggested a model which have a maximum four year initial contract followed with a renewable two year contract.
- The Legislature should consider expanding accountability to coalesce with performance based program budgeting for the community colleges. Keeping these functions as separate activities could continue to water down the usefulness of both.
- The State Board of Community Colleges should review each presidential evaluation for completeness and compliance with legislative requirements.

Overview of Accountability

Since 1990, state policy makers have been increasingly interested in the educational quality, productivity, and effectiveness of public colleges and universities. This move towards greater accountability has been precipitated in most states by decreased state resources of higher education, rising costs, and growing demands for access. Policymakers look to state-level accountability measures to guide planning and budgetary decisions and to monitor the public investment in higher education.

> Accountability policies reflect the view that higher education must be more responsive to state concern and more publicly accountable to a broader constituency that includes students, parents, employers and the general public (Ewell, 1994).

While accountability requirements have built upon rather than replaced previous assessment efforts, the added element of public reporting on a set of performance indicators gave those with a stake in higher education a better sense of what is being achieved with public resources (Ewell, 1994).

The development of state-based performance indicators in higher education must be viewed against the backdrop of a decade-long process of policy evolution.

> Beginning in the early 1980's, state policy makers began to emphasize themes of return on investment as well as the linkage between higher education and the attainment of wider public goals such as work force preparation and the development of an educated citizenry.

The policies that resulted emphasized the assessment of education outcomes but also involved the creation of a range of other mechanisms for inducing quality improvement in undergraduate education, often in the form of incentive funding initiatives. These policy tools were well suited to the state policy climate of the times, emphasizing curricular renewal and experimentation in the context of abundant resources (Richardson, 1994).

The state-mandated assessment programs that emerged during this period strongly resembled one another in their desire to fuse into a single process the dual agendas of improving instruction at the institution level and demonstrating accountability on a statewide basis (Ewell, 1994).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Such accountability methods generally allowed institutions maximum discretion to determine what and how to assess while avoiding institutional comparisons. Most required institutions to engage in assessment within broadly defined domains and to report their findings publicly. State-level review of reported results was viewed as a means to providing institutions with feedback on their evolving assessment programs, as well as a mechanism for ensuring compliance. The policy objective of accountability efforts was to create an ongoing, locally-owned process of continuous self-examination and improvement (Richardson, 1994).

The policy objective of accountability efforts was to create an ongoing, locally-owned process of continuous self-examination and improvement.

By 1990, it was evident that institutional response was both irregular and uneven. Additionally, institutions had to find an effective way to communicate the results of assessment to outside audiences. Institution-centered reports were rich but diffuse, although they rarely allowed policymakers the opportunity to compare institutions or to examine overall system performance.

These drawbacks became increasingly salient in the harsh policy conditions of the early 1990's. New fiscal realities meant that neither states nor institutions could continue to afford assessment as an add-on, and many simply ceased investing in the process. Simultaneously, tight times meant the reemergence of traditional public concerns of higher education's efficiency, embracing issues such as faculty workloads, program duplication, and investments in undergraduate teaching (Ewell, 1994).

Alexander Astin provides a definition of quality in higher education directed towards the goals of accountability:

> The most excellent institutions are, in this view, those that have the greatest impact -- add the most value, as economists would say -- on the student's knowledge and personal development and on the faculty member's scholarly and pedagogical ability and productivity (Astin, 1985).

Overview of Presidential Assessment

According to Kauffman (1993) a performance review, assessment, or evaluation has many possible purposes. Ideally, the purpose is a totally constructive one: to aid in the development of the president and to improve performance and productivity. Assessment should contain elements of feedback and coaching within a mutual-benefit context. It should be useful to the chief executive and always viewed by the trustees as an extension of governing board support.

An effective assessment includes a fresh look at an institution's management and governance, not simply the president's performance. It looks at institutional priorities and goals. It may even touch upon the performance of the governing board (Ingram, 1993). Kerr and Gade (1989) indicated that boards should realize that when they evaluate a president's performance they are also evaluating their own performance in selecting, advising, and supporting the president.

Boards should not directly tie performance reviews to reappointment decisions. If the board has lost confidence in the president, it need not gather evidence to make charges. The board undermines its own authority by soliciting responses to the question of whether or not to let a president continue. The president serves at the pleasure of the board (Kauffman, 1993).

Kauffman indicates that the assessment process should include the following questions:

1. Does the assessment process help attract and retain presidents of the highest quality?

2. Does it help improve the president's performance, productivity, and job satisfaction?

3. Does it aid in the retention of excellent presidents and aid in the rapid elimination of those who are not suitable?

4. Is it regarded as legitimate by those in the community college system?

Florida authorizes the boards of trustees under s. 240.319(3)(l)2 F.S., to enter into a fixed duration contract with a president. The State Board of Education limits the contractual period by rule to no more than 4 years. Concern has been raised over the continuous rollover contract which may impair a board of trustees from removing a president before the contractual period has ended.

Research Design and Methodology

The academic and association literature on community college accountability and presidential assessment was reviewed to provide historical background, current efforts, indicators of success, and policy recommendations. The Higher Education Committee reviewed all 28 community college accountability reports and selected 13 colleges to be part of an expanded study of accountability at the institutional level.

The colleges selected varied by enrollment, program, and geography. To provide an accurate sample for study the following colleges were involved in the expanded study:

Brevard
Broward
Chipola
Edison
Florida Community College Jacksonville
Gulf Coast
Hillsborough
Indian River
Manatee
Miami-Dade
Okaloosa-Walton
Pensacola
Santa Fe

In order to obtain a clear picture of the implementation of accountability within a community college, the following were collected from the 13 community colleges involved in the expanded study.

1. All documents provided to the board of trustees relating to the development of accountability measures, goals and plans.

2. All agendas and minutes from the board of trustees meetings where decisions regarding the accountability process were made.

3. A list of the individuals involved in the accountability process on the campus.

4. A copy of the most recent presidential evaluation and supporting documentation linking the evaluation to the accountability report.

Additionally, a survey instrument was created and administered to the chairpersons of the 13 boards of trustees to determine the board's roles in and perceptions of accountability. The survey was adapted from a Jones and Skolnik instrument used to gauge perceptions of governing board members in Canada and the United States. The chairs were encouraged to suggest modifications to the accountability process to make it more relevant. The interviews evolved into discussions over roles and priorities of the boards and the individual board members. Suggestions ranged beyond accountability and presidential evaluation to the perceptions of governance by the chairpersons. Trends were identified in the general responses which lead to policy recommendations. Suggestions are also incorporated into this report.

Survey Results

The following statements (in italics) were made and the interviewees were asked to respond: Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. All percentages are based on interviews with the 13 chairpersons of the boards of trustees for the colleges in the expanded study.

1. ***A board should confine itself mainly to financial and administrative matters.***

   15% agreed while 85% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

b. *Our board does confine itself mainly to financial and administrative matters.*

   39% agreed while 61% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

2. *A board should not make decisions on academic matters.*

   46% agreed or strongly agreed while 54% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

b. *Our board does not make decisions on academic matters.*

   30% agreed or strongly agreed while 70% disagreed or strongly disagreed

3. *A board should be the final authority for approving major academic policies.*

   93% agreed or strongly agreed while 7% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

b. *Our board does act as the final authority for approving academic policies.*

   100% agreed or strongly agreed.

4. *A board should regularly review the performance of the college in academic areas.*

   100% agreed or strongly agreed.

b. *Our board does regularly review the performance of the college in academic areas.*

   77% agreed or strongly agreed while 23% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. *A board should act as a "watchdog" on behalf of the public interest.*

100% agreed or strongly agreed.

b. *Our board does act as a "watchdog" on behalf of the public interest.*

93% agreed or strongly agreed while 7% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

6. *A board should ask "tough questions" of senior community college administrators.*

100% agreed or strongly agreed.

b. ***Our board does ask "tough questions" of senior community college administrators.***

84% agreed or strongly agreed while 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

7. *A board should periodically review the performance of the college president.*

100% agreed or strongly agreed.

b. ***Our board does periodically review the performance of the college president.***

100% agreed or strongly agreed.

8. ***A board should periodically review its own performance.***

100% agreed or strongly agreed.

b. ***Our board does periodically review its own performance.***

53% agreed or strongly agreed while 47% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

9. *A board should play an active role in lobbying for change in government policy.*

84% agreed or strongly agreed while 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

b. ***Our board does play an active role in lobbying for change in government policy.***

69% agreed or strongly agreed while 31% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. ***I believe that my role on the board is to represent the interests of a specific constituency inside or outside the college.***

54% disagreed while 46% strongly disagreed.

11. ***I believe that my role on the board is to make decisions that are in the best interests of the broader society.***

69% strongly agreed while 31% agreed.

12. ***I believe my role on the board is to make decisions in the best interest of the college as a whole.***

46% strongly agreed while 54% agreed.

13. ***I believe that policy recommendations are fully researched and board members are fully briefed.***

77% agreed or strongly agreed while 23% disagreed or strongly

14. ***I believe that the president provides adequate and objective information to the board.***

85% agreed or strongly agreed while 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Survey Findings

The survey was designed to gauge the chairperson's perceptions of the roles of each board of trustees. Each statement was countered to gain their viewpoint on how the board actually performed in its duties. The following key findings were noted:

- Although 85% of the Chairs thought that a board should not confine itself to mainly financial and administrative matters, 38% thought the board did confine itself to those matters.
- The Chairs were evenly split (46% agree/54% disagree) on whether a board should make decisions on academic matters.
- Almost a quarter (23%) thought that the board did not regularly review the academic performance of the college.
- All of the chairs thought that the board should ask "tough questions" of senior community college administrators, although 16% thought that the board did not.
- All chairs thought they should review the board's performance although only half (53%) indicated that the board reviewed its performance. Only one chairman indicated a formal evaluation process.
- Almost a quarter (23%) indicated that policy recommendations are not fully researched and board members are not fully briefed.
- Almost all (85%) chairs believed that the president provides adequate and objective information to the board.

Findings and Conclusions

- The Legislative reporting function of accountability has been successfully implemented at both the institutional level and at the system level.

- The implementation of accountability as an institutional assessment tool, where the boards of trustees are intimately involved in the process, is not uniformly apparent. The chairs of most board of trustees surveyed were familiar with accountability at a basic level. The board's involvement in accountability varied from direct involvement to no involvement. At two colleges the board was briefed each meeting on some measure of accountability; for the rest, accountability was an annual report approved by the board.

- The majority of chairpersons were unaware or unsure of their role in accountability and indicated that board members were informed about accountability as opposed to involved in accountability.

- The literature indicated that Florida was limited in the breadth of the performance indicators which we required for accountability. This was confirmed by some trustees who, referring to their own institutions' efforts, had expanded the performance indicators to display what was relevant at their campus.

- Most presidential evaluations received displayed no direct linkage to accountability. At some institutions workshops on accountability efforts were conducted between the trustees, the president, and senior community college administrators.

- Board members who had served for more than four years indicated ignorance on some of the most recent legislative mandates. They suggested requiring orientation for reappointed board members. Some members thought that orientation should be required every two years.

- Generally, those institutions which had recently been through or were preparing for an accreditation review (SACS) appeared to have more comprehensive accountability reports than those who had not had a review for some time.

- Board members appeared to have limited perspective on the roles and practices of trustees in other Florida institutions, systems and states. There appeared to be no formal contact among trustees from other colleges within Florida.

- Continuous multi-year contracts for presidents were discussed with board members. A majority of chairpersons indicated the need for job security for the president, but desired more authority to annually review and reappoint the president.

- The State Board of Community Colleges in coordination with all the boards of trustees, should develop a statement of principles to guide the conduct of trustees.

Policy Recommendations

- The Legislature should consider requiring every board of trustees to have an independent internal auditor or other independent staff separate from the president's staff. Current law provides permissive language regarding the hiring of an internal auditor by the boards of trustees.

- The Legislature should consider requiring each board of trustees to submit to an outside assessment of the board itself every three years. Although most chairpersons indicated some level of board self-study, none indicated a formal process. This could be conducted similar to a program review by the Division to reduce cost.

- The Legislature should consider requiring each president to submit to an outside assessment three years. If this course of action was taken it might be necessary to restrict the open records law. The open records law, even in the environment of an outside assessment, could compromise the review, limiting its value. Again, this could be conducted by Division staff to reduce cost.

- The Legislature should consider requiring each trustee, upon appointment and reappointment, to take part in the Division sponsored trustee orientation.

- The Legislature should consider limiting the contractual period for presidents without affirmative renewal by the boards of trustees. The Division has suggested a model which is supported by the presidents. This model would have a maximum initial four year contract followed with a renewable two year contract.

- The Council of Presidents should establish a single, useful, and practical presidential evaluation instrument to be used by all boards of trustees. This evaluation instrument should be designed to meet all legislative mandates as well as provide some portion which could be tailored to the individual institution.

- The legislature should consider expanding the institutional accountability report to include a description of the progress made by the college on institutional effectiveness as required by accreditation. Although accreditation review occurs every ten years the college is expected to improve on its goals annually.

Appendix 1: Community College Accountability Process.

240.324 Community college accountability process.--

(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that a management and accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing improvement and assessment of the improvement of the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System. Accordingly, the State Board of Community Colleges and the community college boards of trustees shall develop and implement a plan to improve and evaluate the instructional and administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the State Community College System. This plan must address the following issues:

(a) Graduation rates of A.A. and A.S. degree-seeking students compared to first-time enrolled students seeking the associate degree.

(b) Minority student enrollment and retention rates.

© Student performance, including student performance in college-level academic skills, mean grade point averages for community college A.A. transfer students, and community college student performance on state licensure examinations.

(d) Job placement rates of community college vocational students.

(e) Student progression by admission status and program.

(f) Vocational accountability standards identified in s. 239.229, F.S.

g) Other measures as identified by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and approved by the State Board of Community Colleges.

(2) By January 1, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a plan for addressing these issues. The plan must provide a specific timetable that identifies specific issues to be addressed each year and must provide for full implementation by December 31, 1994. Beginning December 31, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit an annual interim report providing the results of initiatives taken during the prior year and the initiatives and related objective performance measures proposed for the next year. The initial plan and each interim plan shall be designed in consultation with staff of the Governor and the Legislature.

(3) Beginning January 1, 1993, the State Board of Community Colleges shall address within the annual evaluation of the performance of the executive director, and the boards of trustees shall address within the annual evaluation of the presidents, the achievement of the performance goals established in the community college accountability plan.

Appendix 2: Community college districts; establishment and organization of boards of trustees.

240.313 Community college districts; establishment and organization of boards of trustees.–

(1) Each community college district authorized by law and the Department of Education is an independent, separate, legal entity created for the operation of a community college.

(2) Community college district boards of trustees shall be comprised of five members when a community college district is confined to one school board district; seven members when a community college district is confined to one school board district and the board of trustees so elects; and not more than nine members when the district contains two or more school board districts, as provided by regulations of the state board.

(3) Trustees shall be appointed by the Governor, approved by four members of the State Board of Education, and confirmed by the Senate in regular session; however, no appointee shall take office until after his or her appointment has been approved by four members of the State Board of Education; further, the State Board of Education shall develop rules and procedures for review and approval of the appointees. Prior to the time the Governor appoints any member of any community college district board of trustees, the school board or boards in the community college district may submit to the Governor for his or her consideration the names of two or more persons for each office.

(4) Members of the board of trustees shall receive no salary but may receive reimbursement for expenses as provided in s. 112.061, including mileage to and from official board meetings.

(5) At its first regular meeting after July 1 of each year, each board of trustees shall organize by electing a chair, whose duty as such is to preside at all meetings of the board, to call special meetings thereof, and to attest to actions of the board, and a vice chair, whose duty as such is to act as chair during the absence or disability of the elected chair. It is the further duty of the chair of each board of trustees to notify the Governor, in writing, whenever a board member fails to attend three consecutive regular board meetings in any one fiscal year, which absences may be grounds for removal.

(6) A community college president shall be the executive officer and corporate secretary of the board of trustees as well as the chief administrative officer of the community college, and all the components of the institution and all aspects of its operation are responsible to the board of trustees through the president.

(7) The board of trustees shall have the power to take action without a recommendation from the president and shall have the power to require the president to deliver to the board all data and information required by the board in the performance of its duties.

Appendix 3: Community college district boards of trustees; duties and powers

240.319 Community college district boards of trustees; duties and powers.--

(1) Each community college district board of trustees is vested with the responsibility to operate its respective community college and with such necessary authority as may be needed for the proper operation and improvement thereof in accordance with rules of the State Board of Education and State Board of Community Colleges.

(2) In carrying out this responsibility, the trustees, after considering recommendations submitted by the community college president, shall be authorized to adopt such rules, procedures, and policies as are necessary to operate the community college in such a manner as to assure the fulfillment of the responsibilities assigned to the board of trustees. These rules, procedures, and policies may supplement those prescribed by the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges if they will contribute to the more orderly and efficient operation of the state community college system.

(3) Such rules, procedures, and policies for the boards of trustees include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Each board of trustees shall appoint, suspend, or remove the president of the community college. The board of trustees may appoint a search committee. Periodic evaluations of the president shall be conducted in accordance with rules of the State Board of Community Colleges; and such evaluations shall be submitted to the State Board of Community Colleges for review.

(b) Each board of trustees has responsibility for the establishment and discontinuance of program and course offerings; provision for instructional and noninstructional community services,

© Each board of trustees constitutes the contracting agent of the community college. It may when acting as a body make contracts, sue, and be sued in the name of the board of trustees. In any suit, a change in personnel of the board shall not abate the suit, which shall proceed as if such change had not taken place,

(d) Whenever the Department of Education finds it necessary for the welfare and convenience of any community college to acquire private property for the use of the community college and the property cannot be acquired by agreement satisfactory to the district board of trustees of such community college and the parties interested in, or the owners of, the private property, the district board of trustees may exercise the right of eminent domain after receiving approval therefor from the State Board of Education and may then proceed to condemn the property in the manner provided by chapters 73 and 74.

(e) Each board of trustees may enter into lease-purchase arrangements with private individuals or corporations for necessary grounds and buildings for community college purposes, other than dormitories, or for buildings other than dormitories to be erected for community college purposes. Such arrangements shall be paid from capital outlay and debt service funds as provided by s. 240.359(2), with terms not to exceed 30 years at a stipulated rate. The provisions of such contracts, including building plans, are subject to approval by the Department of Education, and no such contract may be entered into without such approval. The State Board of Education is authorized to promulgate such rules as it deems necessary to implement the provisions of this paragraph.

(f) Each board of trustees may purchase, acquire, receive, hold, own, manage, lease, sell, dispose of, and convey title to real property, in the best interests of the college, pursuant to rules adopted by the State Board of Education.

(g) Each board of trustees is authorized to enter into agreements for, and accept, credit card payments as compensation for goods, services, tuition, and fees. Each community college is further authorized to establish accounts in credit card banks for the deposit of credit card sales invoices.

(h) Each board of trustees may adopt, by rule, a uniform code of appropriate penalties for violations of rules by students and employees. Such penalties, unless otherwise provided by law, may include fines, the withholding of diplomas or transcripts pending compliance with rules or payment of fines, and the imposition of probation, suspension, or dismissal.

(I) Each board of trustees may consider the past actions of any person applying for admission or employment and may provide, by board rule or procedure, for denying admission, enrollment, or employment to a person if past actions have been found to disrupt or interfere with the orderly conduct, processes, functions, or programs of any other university, college, or community college.

(j) Each board of trustees is authorized to develop and produce work products which relate to educational endeavors which are subject to trademark, copyright, or patent statutes. To this end, the board shall consider the relative contribution by the personnel employed in the development of such work products and shall enter into binding agreements with such personnel, organizations, corporations, or government entities, which agreements shall establish the percentage of ownership of such trademarks, copyrights, or patents. Any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, the board is authorized in its own name to:

1. Perform all things necessary to secure letters of patent, copyrights, and trademarks on any such work products and to enforce its rights therein.

2. License, lease, assign, or otherwise give written consent to any person, firm, or corporation for the manufacture or use thereof on a royalty basis or for such other consideration as the board deems proper.
3. Take any action necessary, including legal action, to protect the same against improper or unlawful use of infringement.
4. Enforce the collection of any sums due the board for the manufacture or use thereof by any other party.
5. Sell any of the same and execute all instruments necessary to consummate any such sale.
6. Do all other acts necessary and proper for the execution of powers and duties provided by this paragraph.

(k) Each board of trustees shall provide rules governing parking and the direction and flow of traffic within campus boundaries and may hire appropriate personnel to enforce campus parking rules. Such persons have no authority to arrest or issue citations for moving traffic violations. The board of trustees may adopt, by rule, a uniform code of appropriate penalties for violations. Such penalties, unless otherwise provided by law, may include the levying of fines, the withholding of diplomas or transcripts pending compliance with rules or payment of fines, and the imposition of probation, suspension, or dismissal. Moneys collected from parking rule infractions shall be deposited in appropriate funds at each community college for student financial aid purposes.

(l) 1. Each board of trustees shall provide for the appointment, employment, and removal of personnel. The board shall determine the compensation, including salaries and fringe benefits, and other conditions of employment for such personnel, including the president.

2. The board is authorized to enter into a contract with the president in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. Any such contract may fix the duration of employment and the compensation therefor and may contain any other terms and conditions the board deems appropriate. In addition, the board may furnish the president with the use of a motor vehicle or an allowance in lieu thereof. If any such vehicle is furnished, the board shall determine and fix the maximum noncollege use of the same. Each board of trustees shall, no later than July 1, 1984, adopt, by rule, procedures governing the employment and dismissal of the community college president. Such rule shall be incorporated into the contract for employment.

(m) Each board of trustees may provide for recognition of employees who have contributed outstanding and meritorious service in their fields and may adopt and implement a program of meritorious service awards to employees who propose procedures or ideas which are adopted and which will result in eliminating or reducing community college expenditures or improving community college operations. The community college is authorized to expend funds for such recognition and awards. No award granted under the provisions of this paragraph may exceed $2,000 or 10 percent of the first year's gross savings, whichever is greater.

(n) Each board of trustees may adopt rules to provide for loans, scholarships, and other student services.

(o) Each board of trustees is authorized to establish a policy for law enforcement operations. Each board of trustees is authorized to employ personnel to carry out the duties imposed by this paragraph.

(p) Each board of trustees is authorized to contract for the purchase, lease, or acquisition in any manner (including purchase by installment or lease-purchase contract which may provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid portion of the purchase price and for the granting of a security interest in the items purchased) of equipment required by the college. The board of trustees may choose to have such equipment contracts consolidated under master equipment financing agreements made pursuant to s. 287.064.

(q) Each board of trustees is authorized to establish and maintain a personnel exchange program, by which persons employed within the community college as vocational instructors and comparable administrative and professional staff may be exchanged with persons employed in like capacities by institutions of higher learning which are not under the jurisdiction of the community college, by units of government either within or without this state, or by private industry. The salary and benefits of community college and state personnel participating in the exchange program shall be continued during the period of time they participate in the exchange program, and such personnel shall be deemed to have no break in creditable or continuous state service or employment during the period of time in which they participate in the exchange program. The salary and benefits of persons participating in the personnel exchange program who are employed by institutions, units of government, or private industry shall be paid by the originating employers of those participants. The duties and responsibilities of a person participating in the exchange program shall be the same as those of the person he or she replaces.

(r) Each board of trustees is authorized to enter into contracts to provide a State Community College System Optional Retirement Program pursuant to s. 240.3195 and to enter into consortia with other boards of trustees for this purpose.

(s) Each board of trustees has responsibility for: ensuring that students have access to general education courses as identified in rule; requiring no more than 60 semester hours of degree program coursework, including 36 semester hours of general education course work, for an associate in arts degree; notifying students that earned hours in excess of 60 semester hours may not be accepted by state universities; notifying students of unique program prerequisites identified pursuant to s. 240.209(5)(f); and ensuring that degree program course work beyond general education course work is consistent with degree program prerequisite requirements adopted pursuant to s. 229.551(1)(f)5.

Appendix 4: Community Colleges; legislative intent

240.317 Community colleges; legislative intent.--

It is the legislative intent that community colleges, constituted as political subdivisions of the state, continue to be operated by district boards of trustees as provided in s. 240.315 and that no department, bureau, division, agency, or subdivision of the state exercise any responsibility and authority to operate any community college of the state except as specifically provided by law or rules of the State Board of Education and State Board of Community Colleges.

Appendix 5: Institutional Information Response Summary

Community College	Acct plan	Req. Docs.	Pres. Eval.	Comments
Brevard -- M, C, V	X	X	X	PE-- no link to acct. 93 sacs
Broward -- L, S, V	X	X	X	PE- link appears to be global 93 sacs
Chipola -- S, P, V	X	X	X	PE - link global but addresses target goals achieved -- 88 sacs
Edison -- S, S, NV	X	X	X	PE- One paragraph letter, unknown link to acct. -- 91 sacs
Fl CC JaX -- L, N, V	X	X	X	PE- good link to acct. 94 sacs
Gulf Coast -- S, P, V	X	X	X	PE- No link to acct. 90 sacs
Hillsborough -- L, C, NV	X	X	X	PE- no link to acct. 86 sacs
Indian River -- M, C, V	X	X	X	PE- global link to acct. 93 sacs
Manatee -- S, S, NV	X	X	X	PE- no link to acct. 94 sacs
Miami-Dade -- L, S, V	X	X	X	PE- unknown link to acct. 85 sacs
Okaloosa-Walton -- S, P, NV	X	X	X	PE - linked to acct. Globally 91 sacs
Pensacola -- M, P, V	X	X	X	PE- global link to acct. workshops acct. for trustees. 87 sacs
Santa Fe -- M, C, V	X	X	X	PE - Global link to acct. 92 sacs

M L S (Medium, Large, Small) **NSPC** (North, South, Panhandle, Central)
V, NV (Vocational or no vocational programs) **PE** (Presidential Evaluations)
SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools -- accreditation review)

References

Bogue, Grady, Joseph Creech and John Folger (1993). Assessing Quality in Higher Education: Policy Actions in the SREB States. (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.)

Education Commission of the States (1994) Charting Higher Education Accountability: A Sourcebook on State-Level Performance Indicators. Edited by Sandra Ruppert. Denver, Colorado.

Education Commission of the States (1994) Examples and Summaries of State Initiatives to Develop Goals, Standards and Outcomes. Report by Alex Medler, Research Associate, ECS clearinghouse. Denver, Colorado: May 1994.

Ewell, Peter T. (1990), Assessment and the "New Accountability": A Challenge for Higher Education's Leadership. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Ingram, Richard, T. (1993) Governing Public Colleges and Universities. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Lewis, Ralph G and Douglas H. Smith, (1994) Total Quality in Higher Education. Delray Beach: St. Lucie Press.

Peterson, M and Lisa Mets, (1987) Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC), (1994) Accountability Review: Progress Report. 1994 - Report 1. December 1994.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (1992) Resource Manual on Institutional Effectiveness. The commission on colleges of the southern association of colleges and schools, Decatur, Georgia.

State of Florida, Office of the Auditor General. (1993) Assessment of the State Community College system Accountability Plan. July 19, 1994.